

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.:	10/693,679	§	Confirmation No.:	8660
Applicant:	Stephanie Marel	§		
Filed:	10/23/2003	§		
TC/A.U.:	2455	§		
Examiner:	Asad M. Nawaz	§		
Title:	Context Filter	§		
Docket No.:	500111540-2	§		
	(HPC.0815US)	§		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Sir:

On September 1, 2009, a telephonic interview was conducted between the undersigned and the Examiner, regarding the Advisory Action dated July 20, 2009, and the indication in the Advisory Action that the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 dated July 2, 2009, would not be entered for purposes of appeal.

The undersigned disagrees with the Examiner that the § 116 Amendment would raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

The Examiner maintained the Examiner's position that he will not enter the § 116 Amendment.

The undersigned indicated that the § 116 Amendment is not necessary to address the issues raised by the Examiner, but rather was submitted merely to remove issues from appeal. In view of the fact that the Examiner refused to withdraw the § 112, ¶ 2, rejection regarding use of "one or more of the structured definitions" in dependent claims 4, 8, 10, and 11, the undersigned indicated that the undersigned will argue against the § 112, ¶ 2, rejection in the Appeal Brief.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

Agreement was reached that the Examiner will withdraw the § 112, ¶ 2, rejection regarding use of the phrase “a method as claimed in” in claims 3-5 and 7-11.

No exhibits or references were discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2009

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883